UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,185	03/29/2001	Ravi L. Sahita	10559/457001/P10868	9173

				EXAMINER
20985	7590	04/12/2006		WANG, LIANG CHE A

FISH & RICHARDSON, PC
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/823,185	SAHITA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Liang-che Alex Wang	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _17 February 2006_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-18 and 35-43_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-18 and 35-43_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _2/13/06_ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18, 35-43 are presented for examination.

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR

1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been

withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/17/06 has been

entered.

The New Grounds of Rejection

3. Applicant's amendment and argument with respect to claims 1-18, 35-43 filed on

2/17/2006 have been fully considered but they are deemed to be moot in views of the new

grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11-13, 15-16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Champlin et al., US Patent Number 6,519,635, hereinafter Champlin,

in views of Ramberg et al., US Patent Number 6,857,013, hereinafter Ramberg.

6. Referring to claim 1, Champlin teaches a managed node comprising:

   a. a first database (item 70 is viewed as a first database, Figure 4) having metadata

       descriptive of data stored in a second database (MIB 72 is viewed as a second

       database)(Col 5 lines 21-23, various translation are stored in table 70 to map MIB

       object from MIB 72, Col 5 lines 15-18. Translation of data is a description of the

       original data, therefore data stored in the table 70 is viewed as metadata

       descriptive of data stored in MIB 72);

   b. a first process in communication with said second database (Figure 4, SNMP

       agent 64 must be in communication with MIB 72 in order to make MIB 72 to be

       functional (Col 5 lines 11-57);

   c. a second process in communication with said first process through a first protocol

       (Col 5 lines 45-48), said second process receiving communication transmitted

       across a network using a second format and having access to said metadata in said

       first database for translation between said first and second formats (Col 5 lines

       11-59, translation of protocols are provided between SNMP Manager 62 and

       SNMP Master Agent 64 and Sub Agent 66 to communicate over network 60.)

   Champlin does not teach the use of second protocol and translation between said first

and second protocols

However, Ramberg teaches the use of second protocol (communication protocol of ADC devices) and translation between first (SNMP protocol) and second protocols (Col 7 lines 55-58).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of translating between the communications protocol of ADC devices and the standardized SNMP protocol using information from MIB of Ramberg in Champlin such that to have translation between said first and second protocols in Champlin, because both Champlin and Ramberg teach inventions relates to translating information in a SNMP environment using MIB (see figure 4 of Champlin and figure 2 of Ramberg.)

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Champlin because having the MIB of Champlin containing information for translation between protocols would allow Champlin's system to communicate with devices outside of SNMP environment as taught by Ramberg (figure 2 and related section)

7. Referring to claim 2, Champlin teaches the managed node of claim 1, wherein said first process comprises an SNMP agent (Figure 4 item 64 is a SNMP agent.)

8. Referring to claim 3, Champlin teaches the managed node of claim 1, wherein said second process comprises a network shim layer providing an interface between said first process and said network (item 70 serves the function of translating the protocol format into the second format of appropriate SNMP agent 66, which serves the same function as the network shim layer is providing. Col 5 lines 41-51.)

9. Referring to claim 5, Champlin teaches the managed node of claim 1, wherein said second database comprises a MIB (item 72, figure 4).

10. Referring to claim 6, Champlin teaches the managed node of claim 1, wherein said first protocol comprises an application program interface for said SNMP agent (Col 2 lines 24-26).

11. Referring to claim 8, Champlin teaches the managed node of claim 1, wherein said metadata is obtained from a remote source (Col 5 lines 28-30.)

12. Referring to claim 9, claim 9 encompasses the similar scope of the invention as that of the claim 1, and Champlin further teaches a managed network (see figure 4), comprising: a management station (item 62), and a managed node (item 64) in communication with said management station using a selected protocol (Figure 4 shows SNMP Manager is communicating with SNMP Master Agent.) Therefore, claim 9 is rejected for the same reason as claimed 1 and the further teaching limitation from Champlin.

13. Referring to claims 11-13, 15-16, 18 claims 11-13, 15-16, 18 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 2-3, 5-6, 8. Therefore, claims 11-13, 15-16, 18 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 2-3, 5-6, 8.

14. Claims 4, 7, 10, 14 and 17, 35-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Champlin in views of Ramberg and in further views of Pan et al., US Patent Number 6,775,701, hereinafter Pan.

15. Referring to claim 4, Champlin as modified teaches an invention as described in claims 1 and 3. Champlin as modified does not explicitly taught the protocol comprises COPS-PR protocol.

However, Pan teaches the use the COPS-PR protocol in network communication among network devices (Col 8 lines 53-58.)

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate COPS-PR of Pan in Champlin such that to have the COPS-PR protocol as the protocol for the network communication in Champlin's system, because Champlin is having a network management system where nodes are communicating via a network (figure 4), and Pan is teaching COPS-PR could be the protocol for communication in a network system (Col 8 lines 53-58.)

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Champlin because COPS-PR is one of the well-known protocols along with SNMP, COPS-RSVP, and CLI as taught by Pan (Col 8 lines 55-58), having COPS would allow a query response protocol used to exchange policy data between a server and a set of client, as taught by Pan (Col 8 lines 59-61), to be implemented on Champlin's system.

16. Referring to claim 7, Champlin as modified teaches the invention as described in claim 5. Champlin has not explicitly taught the protocol comprises a COPS protocol.

However, Pan teaches the use the COPS protocol in network communication among network devices (Col 8 lines 53-58.)

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate COPS of Pan in Champlin such that to have the COPS protocol as the protocol for the network communication in Champlin's system, because Champlin is having a network management system where nodes are

communicating via a network (figure 4), and Pan is teaching COPS could be the protocol

for communication in a network system (Col 8 lines 53-58.)

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the

modification to Champlin because COPS is one of the well-known protocols along with

SNMP, COPS-RSVP, and CLI as taught by Pan (Col 8 lines 55-58), having COPS would

allow a query response protocol used to exchange policy data between a server and a set

of client, as taught by Pan (Col 8 lines 59-61), to be implemented on Champlin's system.

17. Referring to claims 10, 14, 17, claims 10, 14, and 17 encompass the same scope of the

invention as that of the claims 4 and 7. Therefore, claims 10, 14, and 17 are rejected for

the same reason as the claims 4 and 7.

18. Referring to claim 35-40, claims 35-40 encompass the same scope of the invention as that

of the claims 1-6. Therefore, claims 35-40 are rejected for the same reason as the claims

1-6.

19. Referring to claim 41-42, claims 41-42 encompass the same scope of the invention as that

of the claims 1-4. Therefore, claims 41-42 are rejected for the same reason as the claims

1-4.

20. Referring to claim 43, Champlin as modified teaches the managed node of claim 41,

wherein the metadata is obtained from a remote source.(Champlin, Col 5 lines 21-23.)

Conclusion

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Liang-che Alex Wang whose telephone number is

(571)272-3992. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 am

. to 5:00 pm.

22. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571)272-4006. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

23. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Liang-che Alex Wang
April 5, 2006

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER